

UNITED STATEDEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. **FILING DATE** FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/513,239 02/24/00 ROMIG E, 28542.00059 **EXAMINER** QM12/0214 Graham & James LLP LHOMG PAPER NUMBER 600 Hasen Way **ART UNIT** Palo Alto CA 94304-1043 3728 **DATE MAILED:**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

02/14/01

11

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/513,239	ROMIG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shian T. Luong	3728
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-7 and 11-18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-10 and 19-22</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.		
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
		Shimology
Attachment(s)		, ()
 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	19) 🔲 Notice of Informa	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3728

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-7 and 11-18, drawn to a method of attaching a label to a container, classified in class 156, subclass 86.
 - II. Claims 8-10 and 19-22, drawn to a safe container with a label, classified in class206, subclass 459.5.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the polymeric layer or the metal layer is attachable to the bottle using adhesive.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with applicant's attorney, Marc Sockel, on February 8, 2001, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 8-10 and 19-22. Method claim 22 is grouped with the product claims because it does not contain the melting step and therefore does not appear to be a distinct invention from the product claims. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Art Unit: 3728

Claims 1-7 and 11-18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 8-10 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Katsura et al (US 5,223,315). Admitted Prior Art on page 1 of the specification discloses the conventional placement of a label on a semi-permeable plastic container. Admitted Prior Art discloses generally all of the elements of the claims, but lacks a metallized polyester layer on the label. However, Katsura et al suggest a container equipped with a label. The label in Figure 1-B has a print layer 3 attached to a metallic layer 5. The metallic layer is bonded to the container. Figure 1C shows a print layer 3 attached to a metal

Art Unit: 3728

layer 5a and the metal layer 5a is attached to a lower polymeric layer 2a. Therefore, it would have been obvious in view of Katsura et al to provide the laminate for the label of Admitted Prior Art to prevent the wrinkle and the bulge on the label. It would have also have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the metal layer out of metallized polyester, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

8. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Dornbusch et al (US 5,223,315). Admitted Prior Art on page 1 of the specification discloses the conventional placement of a label on a semi-permeable plastic container. Admitted Prior Art discloses generally all of the elements of the claims, but lacks a metallized polyester layer and a polymeric layer on the label. However, Dornbusch et al suggest a container equipped with a label. The label in Figure 2 shows a laminated label comprising printed layer 140, metallized layer disposed on the polyester material 114,117, and a plastic layer 130. The plastic layer is bonded to the container. Therefore, it would have been obvious in view of Dornbusch et al to provide the laminate for the label of Admitted Prior Art to prevent the wrinkle and the bulge on the label.

Conclusion

9. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of applications or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical

Art Unit: 3728

section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners, M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Valerie Douglas at (703)308-1337.

For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 305-3579 or (703)305-3580. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify Examiner Luong of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries concerning the merits of the examination should be directed to Shian Luong whose telephone number is (703) 308-2039.

STL

February 12, 2001

Patent Examiner

Shian Vuono